

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1, and 3-10 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1, and 3-10 are rejected by Examiner.
- Claims 1 and 9 are amended by Applicant.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Application No. WO 02/33902 to Straub et al. (Straub) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,160,796 to Zou. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to include the aspect of transmission of a received reset message upon expiration of a time-out. Support for this amendment is found in the as-filed specification at, for example, page 6, line 30 to page 7, line 36: *"Then a timeout is instigated (..) it is processed like the previous message (E4)."*, and at page 8 lines 16-18: *"As may be seen this method leads to transmission of only reset messages at a frequency T, plus the messages signaling alterations of direction in the changes in the number of nodes"*.

Applicant agrees with the current Office Action, page 3 that "Straub does not disclose only transmitting a reset message when an alternation in the change of the number of nodes occurs".

Additionally, Straub does not disclose only transmitting a reset message when an alternation in the direction of change of a number of nodes occurs in addition to transmission, upon expiration of a time out, of a received reset message, said timeout being started upon reception of said received reset message. Straub merely discusses that when several resets occur at short intervals on a cluster only a last reset message before a transmission data slot grant is transmitted by a device connected to another device via a wireless link.

Likewise, Zou, as in Straub, also does not disclose only transmitting a reset message when an alternation in the direction of change of a number of nodes occurs in addition to transmission, upon expiration of a time out, of a received reset message, said timeout being started upon reception of said received reset message. Zou, in col. 12 lines 1-17, merely discusses that *“any topology change within a 1394 will cause a bus reset to occur”* and that *“the CMM is informed of these changes and notifies the Event Manager of these changes along with the information about devices that have disappeared as well those that have become available”* and *“The Event Manager then distributes the related event to all interested HAVI entities or applications (..)”*. Zou is silent about transferring bus resets from one bus to another, Zou only discusses a single network. Zou is silent about reducing the number of bus resets transferred from one bus to another. Zou merely discusses retrieving information from bus resets by a CMM and sending the retrieved information to an Event Manager, which in turn distributes the information to interested entities or applications. Thus, rather than reducing the number of messages transmitted, Zou increases the number of messages transmitted by the transmission of additional messages.

Applicant respectfully submits, that the combination of Straub and Zou would not would lead a person skilled in the art to realize the presently claimed invention as recited by claim 1, where, during a series of reset messages, a bridge head selects the reset messages that it transmits to one or more other buses interconnected on a transparent bridge, and wherein only reset messages caused by an alternation in the direction of change of the number of nodes on said first bus are transmitted in addition to transmission, upon expiration of a time out, of a received reset message, said timeout being started upon reception of said received reset message. Rather, combining the teachings of Straub and Zou would result in transmission of only a last reset in a series of reset messages that occur before a transmission data slot grant, and transmission of additional messages of information retrieved from reset messages. The combination of Straub and Zou would, in addition, not solve one of the problems solved by the invention as recited in claim 1 that is explained at page 6 of the specification where prior art solutions are discussed. The present specification on page 6 states:

“However, if we allow ourselves to omit resets, it may happen that a node is replaced by another and this replacement will not be taken into account, leading to an incorrect picture of the topology of the network.” (Present Specification, page 6)

Applicant submits that at the time of the invention, this problem was not recognized by prior art solutions that allow to reduce the number of bus resets transmitted from one bus to another, e.g. EP 0 961 453 as mentioned in the patent application and Straub. Zou remains silent about reducing the number of bus resets transmitted to one or more other buses. Since neither the problem nor the solution presented in the pending claims is present in the combination of the cited art, then Applicant concludes that one of skill in the art would not have combine the teachings of Staub and Zou to render obvious the presently claimed invention.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the invention as recited in claim 1 would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art under 35 USC §103(a) because all of the elements of the pending claims are not found in the cited references.

Claims 3 and 8 depend from claim 1, and incorporate by reference all of the features of that claim. Therefore, claims 3 and 8 patentably distinguish over the art of record per MPEP per §2143.03.

Independent apparatus claim 9 comprises similar limitations as independent method claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that for at least the reasons as for claim 1, claim 9 is also patentably distinct from the combination of the cited references. Apparatus claim 10 depends from claim 9 and incorporates by reference all of the features of that claim. Therefore, claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the art of record per MPEP per §2143.03.

Claims 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Application No. WO 02/33902 to Straub et al. (Straub) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,160,796 to Zou, in further view of US Pat 6,466,549 to Hattig. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from patentably distinct claim 1 and incorporate by reference all of the features of that claim. Therefore, claims 3 and 8 patentably distinguish over the art of record per MPEP per §2143.03.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-10.

Applicant notes that the present office action does not address pending claims 3, 5, and 7.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the amended pending claims patentably define over the cited art and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections of the pending claims based on the amendments and arguments above.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0832 therefore.

Respectfully submitted,
Burklin, et al.

Date: March 4, 2010

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

Jerome G. Schaefer
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50, 800
(609) 734-6451

THOMSON Licensing LLC
Patent Operation
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312